Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/774,691	LEHTONEN, TUOMO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	John E. Chapman	2856
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>John E. Chapman</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Peter Flanagan</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 6 March 2008	Time:	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description: ☐ Applicant's representative)		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: Rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, 1 st paragraph.		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: Amendment of claim 1 in order to use terminology in the specifiation, specifically to recite that the movable electrode is "supported by springs" rather than "arranged as a torsion beam," since the specifiation does not use the latter terminology.		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
(A	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)